UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,666	01/24/2002	Wolfgang Billinger	P67552US0	8422
JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC 400 SEVENTH STREET N.W.			EXAMINER	
			HOLZEN, STEPHEN A	
SUITE 600 WASHINGTON, DC 20004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	.,		3644	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS 02/02/2007 PAPE		PER ·		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/053,666	BILLINGER ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Stephen A. Holzen	3644
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	Lely filed the mailing date of this communication. C (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 No. This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E.	action is non-final.	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>15,19-28,30 and 32-34</u> is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>24,25 and 28</u> is/are w 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>15,19-23, 26, 27, 30 and 32-34</u> is/are 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	rejected.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) ☐ Notice of Informal P	ite
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/053,666 Page 2

Art Unit: 3644

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/17/2006 have been fully considered but they are fully not persuasive. The examiner withdraws the previous rejection and presents a substantially similar rejection (slightly modified).

The examiner does not agree that elements #13a,b are not a fitting. Elements #13a,b are clearly used to connect the movable part (flap) to the structural part (tail). The examiner cannot think of any other reason why flange #13a would be provided but for the connection between the movable and structural parts.

- 2. To outline the examiner's position:
 - Fitting = #13a,b
 - Bearing = obvious to use one
 - Moveable Part = #11, #14, #15 in combination and illustrated in Figure 1
 - #13a&b connect #11/14/15 to the tail of the aircraft (see Figure 3).
 - Tail of aircraft = Structure component
 - Both skins 11, 12 and the spar 13 are bonded by a pasty thermosetting adhesive to together form a single structure
 - The box-structure airfoil 10 comprises a composite material upper skin 11 forming a top surface of the airfoil, a composite material lower skin 12 forming a bottom surface of the airfoil, and a composite material spar 13 (see Col. 4, lines 50-60) made from CFRP (Carbon Fiber Reinforced Polymer, see Col. 5, lines 33-41).

Art Unit: 3644

- The movable part (#11-15) is an elevator (see Figure 3)
- The fact that Hirahara et al do not employ a resin transfer molding method is of no consequence since this limitation is a product by process limitation. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even through the prior product was made by a different process.
- 3. Claims 15, 19-28, 30 and 32-34 are pending
- 4. Claims 24, 25 and 28 are withdrawn.
- 5. Claims 15, 19-23, 26, 27, 30 and 32-34 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 15, 19, 21-23, 26, 27, 30 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirahara et al (6,234,423).

Hirahara discloses a fitting = #13a,b; Moveable Part = #11, #14, #15 in combination and illustrated in Figure 10 #13a&b connect #11/14/15 to the tail of the aircraft (see Figure 3); both skins 11, 12 and the spar 13 are bonded by a pasty thermosetting adhesive to together form a

Art Unit: 3644

single structure the box-structure airfoil 10 comprises a composite material upper skin 11 forming a top surface of the airfoil, a composite material lower skin 12 forming a bottom surface of the airfoil, and a composite material spar 13 (see Col. 4, lines 50-60) made from CFRP (Carbon Fiber Reinforced Polymer, see Col. 5, lines 33-41). The movable part (#11-15) is an elevator (see figure 3). The fact that Hirahara et al do not employ a resin transfer molding method is of no consequence since this limitation is a product by process limitation. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even through the prior product was made by a different process.

Hirahara does not disclose bearing.

A bearing is a device to permit constrained relative motion between two parts, typically rotation or linear movement

The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that bearings are notoriously well known means to permit constrained relative motion between a structural and a movable part (see for examle www.wikipedia.org).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use a bearing to permit constrained relative motion between the elevator and the tail.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirahara in view 8. of Koppelman et al (3,102,559). Hirahara does not disclose using nylon as a reactive material. Koppelman discloses a composite material formed by impregnating woven structure made of

Art Unit: 3644

nylon fibers with a thermosetting resin (see col. 14, line 22). It would have been obvious to use nylon as the reactive material since nylon allows for improved tensile strengths with relatively high compression strength. Furthermore, it has been held that to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 227 F.2d 197, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960) (selection of a known plastic to make a container of a type made of plastics prior to the invention was held to be obvious.)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen A. Holzen whose telephone number is 571-272-6903. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on 571-272-7045. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/053,666

Art Unit: 3644

Page 6

Sah

.

.